

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/579,402	05/25/2000	KEI-YU KO	11675.114.1		
75	590 03/14/2003				
BRADLEY K DESANDRO			EXAMINER		
WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER			LEE, EUGENE		
60 EAST SOUT SALT LAKE C	TH TEMPLE ZITY, UT 84111		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,		2015		

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				w				
	Application N	o	Applicant(s)	<u>,</u> 01.				
•	09/579,402		KO, KEI-YU					
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
	Eugene Lee		2815					
Th MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cov	er sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	Y IS SET TO E	XPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM					
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replection of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuted the period patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, ho by within the statutory will apply and will exp	owever, may a reply be tim minimum of thirty (30) days fre SIX (6) MONTHS from in to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.				
Status	D	-						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04</u>								
Zajes Tille detien le titte le	his action is nor		resecution as to the	merits is				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	vance except for r <i>Ex parte Quay</i>	le, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.	mento io				
Disposition of Claims	,							
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application								
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consid	leration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requ	irement.						
Application Papers	or							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be field in aboyance. Soo of expension of the drawing the drawing that any objection to the drawing(s) be field in aboyance. Soo of expension of the drawing that any objection to the drawing(s) be field in aboyance. Soo of expension of the drawing that any objection to the drawing(s) be field in aboyance. Soo of expension of the drawing that any objection to the drawing(s) be field in aboyance. Soo of expension of the drawing that any objection to the drawing(s) be field in aboyance. Soo of expension of the drawing that any objection to the drawing(s) be field in aboyance. Soo of expension of the drawing that are the drawing that a								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been r	eceived.						
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
14\\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	stic priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e) (to a provisional	application).				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.								
15)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority und	er 35 U.S.C. §§ 12	0 and/or 121.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s		Notice of Informa	ry (PTO-413) Paper No((s) O-152)				

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 5 thru 8, 11, 13, and 15 thru 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bronner 5,792,703 in view of Lee et al. 5,192,703 in view of Hsue 5,430,328. Bronner discloses (see, for example, FIG. 5) a gate stack 60 comprising a gate insulating layer (gate oxide layer), gate electrode (gate layer), insulating sidewall spacers (spacer) and a cap insulator (silicon dioxide cap) wherein the gate stack is formed on a substrate (semiconductor material layer) 50. A connecting stud (contact plug) 80' resides in an insulator (layer of doped silicon dioxide) 85'. Bronner does not disclose a layer of refractory metal silicide on said gate layer. Lee discloses (see, for example, FIG. 22) a gate stack structure comprising a metal silicide layer 15 on top of a gate layer 10. The metal silicide layer reduces the resistance of the gate electrode. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the metal silicide layer in Bronner's invention in order to reduce the resistance of the gate electrode.

Bronner does not disclose a conductive layer being disposed along said lateral wall of said contact plug. Lee discloses (see, for example, FIG. 22) a contact plug structure comprising a tungsten fill 90 and TiN layer (conductive layer) 85. The TiN layer is a diffusion barrier providing a barrier between the N+ junction and the tungsten fill. The TiN layer also provides a

Art Unit: 2815

low contact resistance. See, for example, column 6, lines 59-*. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the TiN layer in Bronner's invention in order to provide a diffusion barrier and also to reduce the contact resistance.

Bronner in view of Lee does not disclose the conductive layer as being a refractory metal. However, Hsue discloses (see, for example, FIG. 8) a semiconductor device comprising a barrier layer (conductive layer) 20, tungsten contact 22, and insulating layer 16. In column 2, line 67-column 3, line 14, Hsue discloses the barrier layer being Ti/TiN. Hsue further discloses the barrier layer as improving the adhesion between the tungsten and the substrate. The barrier layer also prevents aluminum spiking. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use Ti/TiN in Bronner in view of Lee in order to improve the adhesion between the substrate and the connecting stud, and also to prevent aluminum spiking.

Regarding the limitation "doped silicon dioxide" and claim 6, see, for example, column 4, lines 17. Regarding the limitation that the cap insulator is made of silicon dioxide, see, for example, column 3, lines 19-22.

Regarding claims 3 and 7, Bronner does not disclose the nonconductive material as being undoped silicon dioxide. Lee discloses (column 5, line 53) that the nonconductive material may be silicon dioxide. Silicon dioxide has excellent insulative properties. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use silicon dioxide. since silicon dioxide has excellent insulative properties and it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Art Unit: 2815

Regarding claim 5, see, for example, column 5, line 42 of Lee.

Regarding claim 8, see, for example, column 3, line 17 of Bronner.

- 3. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bronner '703 in view of Lee '703 in view of Hsue '328 as applied to claims 1, 3, 5 thru 8, 11, 13, and 15 thru 18 above, and further in view of Havemann 5,482,894. Bronner in view of Lee in view of Hsue does not disclose the nonconductive material comprising silicon nitride. However. Havemann teaches (see, for example, column 2, line 66) that many different insulative materials (such as silicon dioxide) may be used in the spacers of a gate stack structure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use silicon nitride. since silicon nitride has excellent insulative properties and it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.
- 4. Claims 4 and 9, 10, 14, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bronner '703 in view of Lee et al. '703 in view of Hsue '328 as applied to claims 1, 3, 5 thru 8, 11, 13, and 15 thru 18 above, and further in view of Ahmad et al. 5,208,176. Bronner in view of Lee in view of Hsue does not disclose the semiconductor material being made of monocrystalline silicon. However, Ahmad discloses (see, for example, column 3, lines 39-43) that DRAM semiconductor devices are typically formed on monocrystalline silicon. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use

Art Unit: 2815

monocrystalline silicon in Bronner in view of Lee in view of Hsue in order to have a substrate suitable for a semiconductor device with minimum crystal defect and a smooth surface.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event. however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2815

INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Lee whose telephone number is 703-305-5695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on 703-308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Eugene Lee March 10, 2003

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800